

HULETT HARPER STEWART LLP
BLAKE MUIR HARPER, SBN: 115756
KIRK B. HULETT; SBN: 110726
550 West C Street, Suite 1600
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: (619) 338-1133
Facsimile: (619) 338-1139

Counsel for Movants Westchester Capital
Management, Inc. and Green & Smith
Investment Management L.L.C.
[Additional Counsel on Signature Page]

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

HCL PARTNERS LIMITED
PARTNERSHIP, On behalf of Itself and all
others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

-v-

LEAP WIRELESS INTERNATIONAL,
INC., S. DOUGLAS HUTCHESON, DEAN
M. LUVISA, AMIN I. KHALIFA and
PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS, LLP,

Defendants.

FRANK CHAREK, Individually and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

-v-

LEAP WIRELESS INTERNATIONAL,
INC., S. DOUGLAS HUTCHESON, MARK
H. RACHESKY, AMIN I. KHALIFA,
GLENN UMETSU, and DEAN M. LUVISA,

Defendants.

[Caption continued on next page]

Case No.: 07-cv-2245-BTM-NLS

CLASS ACTION

**MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

DATE: August 15, 2008
TIME: 11:00 a.m.
JUDGE: Hon. Barry Ted Moskowitz
CTRM: 15 (5th Floor)

Case No.: 07-cv-2256-BTM-NLS

1 DEVAY CAMPBELL, Individually and on
2 behalf of all others similarly situated,

3 Plaintiff,

4 -v-

5 LEAP WIRELESS INTERNATIONAL,
6 INC., S. DOUGLAS HUTCHESON, MARK
7 H. RACHESKY, AMIN I. KHALIFA,
GLENN UMETSU, and DEAN M. LUVISA,

8 Defendants.

Case No.: 07-cv-2297-BTM-NLS

1 Class Members Westchester Capital Management, Inc. and Green & Smith Investment
2 Management L.L.C. (together “Westchester Capital”) submit this memorandum in support of their
3 motion for reconsideration of the Court’s May 22, 2008 Order Granting Motions to Consolidate,
4 Appointing New Jersey Carpenters Pension and Benefit Fund as Lead Plaintiff, and Approving
5 Lead Counsel Selection (the “Lead Plaintiff Order”). Westchester Capital seeks reconsideration of
6 that part of the Lead Plaintiff Order that appointed the New Jersey Carpenter Pension and Benefit
7 Funds (the “Carpenter Funds”) as the Lead Plaintiff and approved their selection of Lead Counsel.

8 **I. INTRODUCTION**

9 In late 2007, three federal class actions were filed on behalf of all persons or entities who
10 purchased the securities of LEAP Wireless International Inc. during the period from May 16, 2004
11 to November 9, 2007 (the “Class Period”), pursuing remedies under Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of
12 the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder. Pursuant to the
13 provisions of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act, on January 28, 2008, Westchester
14 Capital filed its Notice of Motion and Motion by Class Members Westchester Capital
15 Management, Inc. and Green & Smith Investment Management L.L.C. for the Consolidation of
16 All Related Actions, for Appointment as Lead Plaintiff and for Approval of Lead Plaintiff’s
17 Selection of Lead Counsel. A competing motion was filed by the Carpenter Funds.

18 After the competing motions were fully briefed, but without hearing oral argument, the
19 Court granted the motions to consolidate and appointed the Carpenter Funds as the Lead Plaintiff
20 in the litigation. The Court also approved the Carpenter Funds’ selection of Lead Counsel. In
21 appointing the Carpenter Funds as the Lead Plaintiff, the Court found that Westchester Capital had
22 not established that it had “authority to sue on behalf of the funds.” Lead Plaintiff Order at 5 (*see*
23 the accompanying Certification of Karin E. Fisch (“Fisch Cert.”), Ex. A). The Court disagreed
24 with the reasoning of those courts that have held that if an investment advisor has unrestricted
25 decision-making authority in connection with its clients’ accounts, then it has standing to sue in its
26 own right for losses in those accounts. *Id.* The Court further found that certain language in the
27 statements of Roy Behren, the Chief Compliance Officer of Westchester Capital and the
28 underlying funds, cast doubt on whether there had been a “specific grant of authority to sue on

1 behalf of the funds.” *Id.* at 7. The Court did not cite to any evidence submitted by the Carpenter
2 Funds refuting Mr. Behren’s statement, issued as Chief Compliance Officer, that Westchester
3 Capital had authority to commence litigation on its own behalf *and* on behalf of the underlying
4 funds. The Court also expressed concern with the fact that certain of the underlying funds were
5 foreign entities. *Id.*

6 Plaintiff now seeks reconsideration of the Lead Plaintiff Order because (1) the losses of the
7 two domestic funds on whose behalves Westchester Capital moved greatly exceed those of the
8 Carpenter Funds and (2) these funds have confirmed their longstanding grant of authority to
9 Westchester Capital to pursue class action litigation, in general, and this action, specifically, on
10 their behalves.

11 **II. DISCUSSION**

12 **A. Foreign Plaintiffs Are Routinely Appointed As Lead Plaintiffs**

13 In the Lead Plaintiff Order, the Court suggested that appointing a foreign fund as lead
14 plaintiff may complicate a case. Here, however, Westchester Capital, the actual movant, is not a
15 foreign entity. Westchester Capital, including those officers and employees who will be
16 responsible for the oversight of the litigation and communications with attorneys, is located in
17 New York. Furthermore, in *In re Molson Coors Brewing Co. Sec. Litig.*, 233 F.R.D. 147 (D. Del.
18 2005), the decision appointing lead plaintiff points out that many courts have approved foreign
19 investors as lead plaintiffs in cases such as this (citing *Blechner v. Daimler-Benz AG*, No. 04-CV-
20 331, slip op. at 1-2 (D. Del. Sept. 16, 2004); *In re Nortel Networks Corp. Sec. Litig.*, No. 01 Civ.
21 1855, 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 15702, at *4 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 8, 2003); and *In re Goodyear Tire &*
22 *Rubber Co. Sec. Litig.*, No. 5:03CV2166, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 27043 (N.D. Ohio May 12,
23 2004)). The court explained, “the notion that a ‘non-domestic . . . investment firm’ is ‘an
24 uncommitted and uncontrollable candidate for lead plaintiff’ has been expressly rejected as
25 ‘insupportable.’” *Molson*, 233 F.R.D at 152 (quoting *Goodyear*, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 27043, at
26 *24).

27 Even if this Court were to reject the reasoning of the courts that routinely appoint foreign
28 entities as lead plaintiffs, the losses of The Merger Fund, a Massachusetts business trust, account

1 for over 88% of the approximately \$7.5 million in losses of the funds advised by Westchester
2 Capital. Fisch Cert., Ex D. The losses of this one fund alone are significantly higher than the
3 approximately \$250,000 in losses suffered by the Carpenter Funds. There is certainly nothing
4 precluding this Court from appointing one member of a group as the Lead Plaintiff.

5 **B. Westchester Capital Had and Has Authority to Pursue This Litigation**

6 In support of its motion, Westchester Capital submitted the Certification of Roy Behren,
7 the Chief Compliance Officer of Westchester Capital and the underlying funds, declaring, under
8 penalty of perjury, that Westchester Capital had “*unrestricted* decision-making authority with
9 respect to the funds they advise and manage”; that he was authorized to take all actions on behalf
10 of the funds “including the right to commence legal actions . . . and the right to seek to serve as
11 lead plaintiff in an action brought pursuant to the federal securities law”; and that Westchester
12 Capital was attorney-in-fact “to take *all* actions” on behalf of the funds. Fisch Cert., Ex. E
13 (emphasis added). This statement from the officer charged with overseeing compliance issues for
14 the funds was not contradicted by any evidence submitted by the Carpenter Funds and the Court
15 cited to no specific underlying fund documents in the Lead Plaintiff Order that would cause
16 anyone to doubt Mr. Behren’s assertion.

17 Instead, the Court focused on Mr. Behren’s statement, in his subsequent declaration, that it
18 was his further belief that the law granted to Westchester Capital the right and standing to
19 commence legal action on its own behalf. Fisch Cert., Ex. F ¶ 4. Thus, Mr. Behren confirmed
20 that, in addition to his belief that he had authority by virtue of the underlying fund documents, he
21 also had authority conveyed as a matter of law. This Court expressed its disagreement with courts
22 holding that investment advisors may serve as lead plaintiffs based on the losses of their clients
23 and stated its opinion that an investment advisor “must show that its client specifically authorized
24 it to bring securities laws claims on their behalf.” Fisch Cert., Ex. A at 7-8. But by focusing on
25 that part of Mr. Behren’s declaration that contained his statement as to his belief about the law,
26 with which the Court ultimately disagreed, the Court overlooked Mr. Behren’s unequivocal
27 statements, as Chief Compliance Officer, that Westchester Capital had unrestricted decision-
28 making authority as to all matters and was authorized to take the actions taken on behalf of the

1 funds. In fact, as pointed out in Westchester Capital's briefing on its original motion, it has been
2 appointed as Lead Plaintiff in a case currently pending in the Southern District of New York
3 before the Honorable Naomi Rice Buchwald in which there has been absolutely no issue raised
4 with respect to the authority of Westchester Capital. *In re Imax Corp. Sec. Litig.*, 240 F.R.D. 88
5 (S.D.N.Y 2007).

6 Subsequent to and in an effort to correct any misconception created by the Lead Plaintiff
7 Order, the funds have confirmed their longstanding belief that Westchester Capital had authority
8 under any and all of the relevant management agreements to commence litigation. Fisch Cert.,
9 Ex. B (domestic funds).

10 **III. CONCLUSION**

11 For the foregoing reasons, Westchester Capital respectfully requests that the Court
12 reconsider that portion of the Lead Plaintiff Order that appointed the Carpenter Funds as the Lead
13 Plaintiff and approved the Carpenter Funds' selection of counsel. Given the size of the losses of
14 The Merger Fund, which are greater by far than the losses of the Carpenter Funds, Westchester
15 Capital is presumptively the most adequate plaintiff. No evidence has been presented to rebut that
16 presumption.

17 DATED: June 23, 2008

HULETT HARPER STEWART LLP
BLAKE MUIR HARPER
KIRK B. HULETT

19
20
21 /s/ Blake Muir Harper

BLAKE MUIR HARPER

22 550 West C Street, Suite 1600
23 San Diego, CA 92101
24 Telephone: (619) 338-1133
25 Facsimile: (619) 338-1139
26
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

ABBEY SPANIER RODD & ABRAMS, LLP
NANCY KABOOLIAN
KARIN E. FISCH

212 East 39th Street
New York, New York 10016
Telephone: (212) 889-3700
Facsimile: (212) 684-5191

Counsel for Movants Westchester Capital
Management, Inc. and Green & Smith Investment
Management L.L.C.